FEBRUARY 1 – 6, 2015: CHISAMBA, LUSAKA, ZAMBIA

AFRICA REGIONAL TRAINING WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT: SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS IN REDD+ AND RELATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

FOREST CARBON, MARKETS AND COMMUNITIES (FCMC) PROGRAM

MAY 2015

The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) launched the Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities (FCMC) Program to provide its missions, partner governments, and local and international stakeholders with assistance in developing and implementing REDD+ initiatives. FCMC services include analysis, evaluation, tools, and guidance for program design support; training materials; and meeting and workshop development and facilitation that support U.S. Government contributions to international REDD+ architecture.

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development by Tetra Tech, through a Task Order under the Prosperity, Livelihoods, and Conserving Ecosystems (PLACE) Indefinite Quantity Contract Core Task Order (USAID Contract No. EPP-I-00-06-00008-00, Order Number AID-OAA-TO-11-00022).

This report was prepared by the Forest Carbon, Markets and Communities Program.

AFRICA REGIONAL TRAINING WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT: SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS IN REDD+ AND RELATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

FOREST CARBON, MARKETS AND COMMUNITIES (FCMC) PROGRAM

MAY 2015

DISCLAIMER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAAS   American Association for the Advancement of Science

ASB   Alternatives to Slash-and-Burn

BCP   BioCarbon Partners

BS   Benefit Sharing

CBNRM   Community-based natural resource management

CCB   Climate, Community and Biodiversity

CEPA   Canadian Energy Pipeline Association

CFP   Community Forests Program

CIFOR   Center for International Forestry Research

COMACO   Community Markets for Conservation

COP   Conference of Parties

CNA   Capacity Needs Assessment

E3   Economic Growth, Education and Environment

ECOWAS   Economic Community of West African States

EMA   Environmental Management Agency

ESMF   Economic and Social Management Framework

FCFP   Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

FCMC   Forest Carbon, Markets, and Communities

FGRM   Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism

FPIC   Free, prior, and informed consent

GBV   Gender-based violence

GIS/RS   Geographic information system/remote sensing

GIT   Geographic Information Technology

GSBA   Globally significant biodiversity area

IUCN   International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

LZRP   Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project

MCCP   Municipal Climate Change Programme

MJUMITA	Mtandao Wa Jamii Wa Usimamizi Wa Misitu Tanzania
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NRM	Natural resource management
NTFP	Non-timber forest products
PERFORM	Protecting Ecosystems and Restoring Forests in Malawi
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancements of forest carbon stocks (REDD+)
SES	Social and Environmental Standards
SESA	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment
SIS	Safeguard information systems
TCFG	Tanzania Forest Conservation Group
TGCC	Tenure and Global Climate Change
UN-REDD	United Nations collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
ZAWA	Zambian Wildlife Authority

OVERVIEW

The Africa Regional Training Workshop on Social and Environmental Considerations in reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancements of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) Programming and Implementation was conducted from February 1 – 6, 2015 in Chisamba, Lusaka, Zambia. The workshop was organized by United States Agency for International Development (USAID), through its Forest Carbon, Markets, and Communities (FCMC) program with support from the USAID Bureau for Economic Growth, Education and Environment (E3) and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service International Programs.

The overall workshop goal was to enhance the social and environmental integrity of the work of USAID and partners in Eastern and Southern Africa on REDD+ and related natural resources management programs.

Specific objectives of the workshop were to:

- Learn about and share global, regional, and national policies, principles, practices, and lessons related to the integration of social and environmental considerations in REDD+ and relevant natural resource management (NRM) sectors;

- Identify the gaps, follow-on opportunities, and priority next steps in the application of the principles, practices and lessons to enhance the social and environmental aspects of NRM programs, including REDD+ in the participant countries.

A group of 42 persons participated in the workshop, coming from the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Nigeria, Peru, Tanzania, Uganda, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Zambia. Participants included representatives from various national government entities, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), international organizations, USAID bilateral Missions, FCMC, and the U.S. Forest Service. (See Annex 1: Workshop Participants.)

The training workshop was designed to be interactive and highly participatory, with many small working group exercises, discussions, and activities to enhance knowledge sharing. These activities and discussions drew from participants' own experience and compared their work and perspectives on REDD+ social and environmental aspects in program planning and implementation.

The workshop methodology also included a one-day field trip to see initiatives being implemented by BioCarbon Partners, a USAID grantee, in the Lower Zambezi Region. Although the field visit was abbreviated due to heavy rains and accessibility problems, the participants were still able to see a conservation agriculture project using integrated farming systems management, an eco-charcoal production site, and a small-scale poultry-raising enterprise.

Participants also identified current actions, gaps, and tentative recommendations for follow-on activities and initiatives in moving REDD+ programs and safeguards forward in their respective countries.

KEY MESSAGES

Throughout the week, participants discussed the challenges and opportunities they face in initiating and implementing REDD+ programs in their respective countries and institutions, and how best to ensure that social and environmental considerations are taken into account fully.

- Social and environmental considerations are necessary for sound development. This approach aims to ensure the feasibility and compatibility of development with local cultural, socioeconomic, and environmental conditions.

- It is important to view REDD+ issues in a broader development context, examining issues such as systems models, theories of change, scale, stakeholder engagement, sustainability, gender, and other social and biodiversity analyses.

- Relevant experience in NRM, community forestry, integrated conservation and development, landscape approaches to biodiversity conservation and development, payments for environmental services, and other broader development experience can provide useful guidance and building blocks for REDD+.

- Even though the integration of social and environmental considerations in REDD+ design and development is occurring at various temporal and spatial scales in many countries, other REDD+ programs are in less advanced states of strategy, design, and implementation.

The training workshop also provided a platform to share knowledge on REDD+ specific concerns within the broader context of social and environmental dynamics. Topics included social and biodiversity safeguards and standards, development of country safeguard systems and safeguard information systems, stakeholder engagement, land and resource tenure and carbon rights, and social and environmental assessment, among other topics. On the final day of the workshop, participants worked in country teams to 1) assess current activities to better understand how to fully integrate gender aspects into their REDD+ programs, and 2) review upcoming actions and plans and how these might be adjusted in light of issues discussed at the workshop.

SESSION SUMMARIES

ARRIVAL: SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 1

The scheduled welcome session for participants was hampered by flight delays for several participants and resulting logistical problems. As a result only about one-third of the participants were able to arrive at the venue for the registration, welcome, introductions, and initial icebreaker session. Organizers decided to wait until the following morning to hold the overall introductions and welcome session.

DAY 1: MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2

Session 1.1: Welcome and introductions

Dr. Diane Russell, Senior Social Scientist with USAID's Forestry and Biodiversity Office, welcomed the participants and opened the workshop. Dr. Russell emphasized the importance of the workshop and its timing in the region, and stressed that ensuring that REDD+ programs and projects are socially and environmentally feasible and sustainable is essential for their success. Mr. Stephen Kelleher, FCMC Chief of Party and workshop organizer, also welcomed the participants to the workshop and highlighted the overall program and the importance of active participation of all to make the workshop a success.

The facilitator, Mr. Gregory Garbinsky, then led the introduction exercise and icebreaker, which allowed the participants to greet and learn more about each other both professionally and personally.

Session 1.2: The Big Picture: Building a Conceptual Model for Addressing Social and Environmental Considerations for REDD+

This session established the foundation for the workshop as a whole, and presented the concept and importance of integrating and addressing social and environmental considerations in REDD+ strategy and program design as well as project implementation. Dr. Russell provided examples of conventional wisdom versus unintended consequences (see PowerPoint presentation for Session 1.2), highlighting that what seem to be obvious solutions sometimes fail over the long term because various long-term causal links are not always explored. She stressed the importance of "seeing the big picture", which is why using systems models (including related "theories of change") and addressing issues are so important. Systems thinking complements and links sectoral analyses (e.g., greenhouse gas flows, biodiversity status, market supply and demand, etc.) and helps to produce a model to understand linkages among variables and to map impact pathways. Systems models could be very useful, for example, in considering drivers of deforestation and building sound national REDD+ strategies. If the overall system is well understood, then targeted policy changes could have big impacts.

Based on some examples presented by Dr. Chad Dear, American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Fellow with the USAID Global Development Lab, participants worked in small groups on systems models related to their own experiences and observations, identifying stressors and root causes, threats to and drivers of deforestation and afforestation, and direct impacts on the status of forests and natural resources. The exercise highlighted the fact that REDD+ is still evolving, and it is

important to consider what issues need to be analyzed to ensure that REDD+ will have the maximum benefit without negative unintended consequences.

Session 1.3: Key Social and Environmental Components and Definitions

Dr. Russell presented another foundational session on the key terms and concepts in REDD+ and natural resources management in order to ensure that all participants have a common understanding of the subject matter and common definitions. Areas such as stakeholder engagement, safeguards, standards, environment, biodiversity, impact assessment, and other social and environmental topics were presented and discussed.

Participants were given an opportunity to identify any social and environmental terms, concepts, or issues that they thought were missing and to identify and present any additional definitions of terms that might be specific to their own countries, institutions, or projects.

Session 1.4: Social and Environmental Challenges and Opportunities – World Café Session

Mr. Garbinsky introduced the World Café methodology, whereby participants circulated around tables where a specific topic was addressed. A facilitator hosted each of the four topic tables.

The outputs were gathered during each topic table round, and participants circulated to three of four tables set up to focus on the following key question in the allotted timeframe for that round:

- The four tables were organized and moderated accordingly by:
    - Group 1: Environmental Challenges (D. Russell)
    - Group 2: Environmental Opportunities (S. Kelleher)
    - Group 3: Social Challenges (T. Blomley)
    - Group 4: Social Opportunities (C. Dear)
- Key Question: What are the most significant challenges and opportunities in implementing REDD+ programs in your country and your experience?
    - Round 1: 20 minutes
    - Round 2: 15 minutes
    - Round 3: 10 minutes

Participants were free to choose their top three topics and to rotate in the three rounds. Following the rotations, participants ranked the top two most significant ideas/concepts/issues from each topic. These sessions were quite lively and generated a lot of discussion. Each topical discussion covered a wide range of issues, and some selected issues are summarized here. (See also **Annex 3, Session 1.4 World Café Outputs on Social and Environmental Challenges and Opportunities**). The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of 'votes' that that particular item received, indicating the highest-priority elements in each category.

Group 1: Environmental Challenges

- Deforestation (+14)

- Overlapping mandates of agencies and ministries leads to conflict and poor management (+13)

- Encroachment (+12)

Group 2: Environmental Opportunities

- Environmental outcomes for REDD (+22), including:

  – Through increased forest protection REDD+: increased water quantity and quality from watershed areas

  – Increased forest cover

  – Carbon sequestration improved ecosystem services

  – Improved carbon sequestration, stabilized soil fertility, recycled water, improved productivity, stabilized soil structure

  – Stabilized soil fertility, stabilized soil structure, enhanced soil fertility

  – Implementation enhanced carbon stocks, i.e., good air quality

  – Reduced siltation; thus, reduced flooding

- Opportunities for landscape-scale management (+20), including:

  – Sustainable Agricultural Production

  – Creation of Forest Management Plans

  – REDD+ is a landscape-scale pursuit, and harmonization of all NRM policies is needed for REDD+ to work; it's not so much an environmental opportunity, but rather a requirement

  – Wildlife conservation

  – Integrated project

    - Multi-disciplinary

    - Multi-scales

  – Trans-frontier environment protect implementation

  – Climate that supports tree planting

- Opportunities: Additional Land interventions (+12), including:

  – Environmental opportunities

    - Presence of sound environmental laws and policies

    - Improved community participation in environmental conservation

  – Recognition of the link between environment and development at the international level

  – Data from multiple sources(+9)

  – Biodiversity inventories in gazetted forest reserves = protection absent formal MRV

- Incorporate a broad suite of environmental data needs into REDD+ pursuits (e.g., National Forest Inventory)
- REDD+ provides financial resources to improve NRM capacity biodiversity (+3)

Group 3: Social Challenges (and Risks and Threats)

- Economic value of REDD+ (including benefits) may not be competitive with other land use choices (+18)

- Loss of livelihoods for forest-dependent communities for charcoal, non-timber forest products (NTFP), timber, etc. (+8)

- Elite capture, including land and resource "grabbing" (+8)

- Horizontal benefit-sharing arrangement (+7)

Group 4: Social Opportunities

- Local governance (+26), including:
    - Enhancement of local governance for NRM
    - Improved multi-scale governance and transparency
    - Improved local government capacity
- Local empowerment (community-based natural resource management [CBNRM]) (+13), including:
    - Decentralization (looking at village-, district-, and national-level administration linkages)
    - Community empowerment
        - Education/scholarship for children
        - Microfinance
    - Free prior informed consent
- Clarity of tenure (+11), which includes the following subcategories:
    - Improved land/forest tenure
    - Define resource rights
    - Clarify community individual boundary and responsibilities

Participants were requested to link these challenges and opportunities to inform their discussions and the development of a potential systems model that encompasses REDD+ programs and NRM.

Session 1.5: USAID Climate Change/REDD+ Policy Overview

Mr. Evan Notman, of USAID's Global Climate Change office, presented this session via remote hookup through GoToMeeting. He gave an overview of U.S. Government policies and programs on REDD+, climate change, and low-emissions development strategies. He stressed that USAID is a development agency, so all of its work on REDD+ and climate change is within a development perspective with the

goal to help countries accelerate their transition to climate-resilient, low-emission development. USAID embraces an overarching principle of strengthening development outcomes through direct climate change program investments and by integrating climate change throughout USAID programming, learning, policy dialogues, and internal operations.

Mr. Notman closed with a general overview of USAID's Sustainable Landscapes pillar, the goal of which is to contribute to moving countries into a low greenhouse gas emissions, high carbon sequestration development pathway in the land use sector. He emphasized that programs should work toward one or both of the following results:

- Established or improved national frameworks for low-emission development

- Presence of capacity in partner countries for national-scale implementation of LEDS in the land-use sector, including REDD+ activities

Sessions 1.6 and 1.7: Small Group Work on Systems Model

Sessions 1.6 and 1.7 were combined to give participants time to consolidate the results of the World Café session and incorporate their additional information and discussions in the development of their systems models that they began developing in Session 1.2

DAY 2: TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3

Session 2.1: Biological Diversity and REDD+: How can REDD+ deliver on biodiversity conservation objectives?

Mr. Stephen Kelleher, FCMC Chief of Party and workshop organizer, opened this session by presenting the findings from an FCMC study on "REDD+ and Biodiversity Conservation: Approaches, Experiences, and Opportunities for Improved Outcomes". The objectives of the session were to summarize how biodiversity issues are being addressed in existing REDD+ activities, to demonstrate a biodiversity integration case study in Malawi, and to work on developing recommendations on how REDD+ activities could be designed/managed to enhance biodiversity impacts of future REDD+ activities. Mr. Kelleher presented an overview of the National REDD+ programs and biodiversity conservation elements globally. He noted that of the 14 National REDD+ programs reviewed, none provided specific targets for biodiversity conservation, and only half of them had even general statements about biodiversity in REDD+ (Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, and Vietnam).

Overall conclusions of the review of National REDD+ programs indicate that most provide only preliminary information on how biodiversity issues will be addressed and little information on specific policies and monitoring. Additionally, no countries currently describe how subnational activities could contribute to national biodiversity goals or monitoring. In addressing Forest Carbon projects, Mr. Kelleher concluded that all projects reviewed do describe biodiversity goals, but that types and specificity vary; none described national biodiversity priorities, but all of the projects claimed biodiversity benefits. He noted that long-term monitoring will be needed to identify the full extent of biodiversity impacts.

The second presentation was a case study prepared by Yoel Kirschner, Forest Service REDD+ Specialist based in Malawi, highlighting the linkages of the Malawi REDD+ Program. The presentation slides summary may be found in Annex 4.

For the small group work, participants were organized into country groups and were given the following questions to discuss and present the results in plenary:

- Has your country integrated biodiversity considerations into National REDD+ Strategies, policies, or projects? If so, how? If not, why?

- Are biodiversity conservation policies in place that can be used to inform REDD+ strategies in your country, institution, or program? What are these policies, and how have you applied them to REDD+?

- What are the opportunities and challenges for integrating biodiversity into REDD+, taking into account the approach in Malawi?

The results are presented in **Annex 3, Day 2: Session 2.1 on Biodiversity**.

Session 2.2: Social Diversity and Engagement – REDD+ Stakeholder Engagement

Dr. Chad Dear opened the session by asking the participants to come up with examples of stakeholder engagement in their work and then categorize it on a spectrum (marked on a wall) from Passive (less engagement) on one end to Active (more engagement) on the other. Participants were asked to place their example on a card describing a) how stakeholders were engaged; b) why were they engaged; and c) who was engaged. Some participants then placed their card example on the wall spectrum and had to describe the engagement and why they placed it where they did. The exercise was designed to demonstrate that there are different types of stakeholder engagement, and that various types are appropriate to different situations, i.e., "one size does not fit all."

Mr. Garbinsky and Mr. Dear led the second exercise titled, "The Web of REDD+ Life," in which participants read a specific role-play scenario regarding a national REDD+ program in a fictitious country. The fictitious REDD+ National Coordinator aims to facilitate effective and coordinated implementation of REDD+ related policies, processes, and activities. Then the 36 participants were each assigned the role of a specific stakeholder in the scenario, e.g., government entities, local community, donors, international organizations, consumers and producers. With a ball of yarn, participants then identified a key stakeholder for them and passed them the ball of yarn while holding onto the end. The receiving stakeholder then repeated the action and identified the next engaged stakeholder. The debriefing for this exercise focused on:
- Who did and did not receive the yarn (connection)?
- Which stakeholders had more connections?
- Should some stakeholders be connected but are not?
- What are implications for REDD+ activities?
- Are there obvious points of intervention to help achieve REDD+ goals?
- How does exercise this relate to your own experiences?

Dr. Russell followed up this session and highlighted various stakeholder engagements, particularly involving indigenous people and various people-centered, gender-sensitive stakeholders.

Indigenous peoples and forest-dependent communities, as well as other key social groups — women; elders; youth; vulnerable groups (poor, disabled, landless); local communities indirectly affected; and those involved in illegal activities — are often at the greatest risk of being left out. Stakeholder engagement is vital to build and make best use of social capital.

Session 2.3: Models of Benefit Sharing: Lessons from others

Mr. Tom Blomley, FCMC Consultant, presented "Benefit-Sharing and REDD+: Considerations and Options for Equitable and Effective Arrangements", which focused on the rationale and basis for benefit-sharing in REDD+; examples and models of benefit-sharing arrangements (good and bad); and key steps in the design and development of a benefit-sharing system.

As the rationale and basis for benefit-sharing, Mr. Blomley highlighted that various options and models exist for benefit sharing under REDD+. This includes benefits going to those with clear rights to land and clear tenure, those who demonstrate that they are good stewards of lands and forests, those who incur greatest costs, those who achieve reductions in deforestation and forest degradation (outputs), those who put most in (inputs), or the poorest and most marginalized. He gave specific examples of how benefit-sharing was being implemented in Tanzania and Nepal.

Ending the presentation portion, Mr. Blomley identified four key steps to designing a benefit-sharing arrangement:

1. Clarify the objectives and determine the scope of benefits

2. Identify beneficiaries and eligibility criteria

3. Determine the structure and type of benefits

4. Determine governance and oversight arrangements

Further detail are available in **Annex 4 Slide presentations, Session 2.3 Benefit-Sharing and REDD+.**

During the small group activity, participants were organized into country/regional groups and asked to think through existing models for benefit-sharing in their respective countries or region in the arena of REDD+. Examples to consider are collaborative forest management, community wildlife management, and revenue sharing from protected areas or other benefit sharing arrangements. Participants shared their various experiences and observations with the plenary group and discussed differences and similarities.

Session 2.4: Building from Experience: Community Forestry

Mr. Blomley also presented this session, which emphasized the lessons learned from community forest management practices that are relevant for REDD+. Drawing on the group's experience, he led a brainstorming activity to identify the positive impacts of community forestry that participants have experienced or about which they are knowledgeable.

Among the positive impacts cited were: improved forest management; improved access and management rights for local people, leading to livelihood benefits (subsistence and some cash); improved forest governance and decision-making (community level and higher); and improved skills, capacity, and social capital.

More complete details on the lessons learned are available in **Annex 4, Session 2.4 Community Forestry: Lessons learned of Relevance to REDD+.**

DAY 3: WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4

Field Trip to BioCarbon Partners (BCP) Project Sites: Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project (LZRP)

Prior to the field trip, Dr. Hassan Sachedina, BCP Managing Director and REDD+ Technical Lead, gave an overview of the BioCarbon Partners activities in Zambia, particularly the Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project that would be visited during the field trip. Citing Zambia as an example of tropical deforestation, Mr. Sachedina stated that while Zambia is the fourth-highest forested country in Africa, it has the highest deforestation rate/year and is in the global top five for deforested amount and global top 10 in per capita deforestation emissions according to the United Nations collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (UN-REDD).

The Project Zone for the LZRP includes stakeholder communities, encompasses approximately 120,000 hectares of peri-urban community land in Lusaka Province, and includes about 1,200 households and 8,300 community residents. The LZRP is a REDD+ pilot demonstration project launched in 2012 on 39,000 hectares of private land. Carbon credits are generated on private land investments made in community livelihood activities on adjacent community land. The project, partially funded by USAID, is a REDD+ project and has completed verification of emission reductions under the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) and has been validated to the Gold level of the Climate, Community and Biodiversity (CCB) Standards Second Edition for climate change adaptation and exceptional community and biodiversity benefits.

The five core activities of the LZRP follow:

1. **Livelihood improvement**: providing incentives and alternatives for communities in order to reduce the pressures on forested areas and preserves, including eco-charcoal enterprise development, village poultry production, and conservation agriculture initiatives

2. **Conservation**: including job creation, community capacity-building, collaboration with the Zambian government authorities in the forestry department and wildlife authority and establishing sustainable conservation financing

3. **Forest carbon science:** conducting community-based biomass and soil measurements, in addition to geographic information system/remote sensing (GIS/RS), to show rates of historical deforestation and independent validation/verification against international standards (VCS, CCB)

4. **Market creation:** low-demand, voluntary market creation, payment for environmental services, and sustainable conservation financing

5. **Government of the Republic of Zambia Engagement/Policy development:** Jurisdictional REDD+ collaboration engagement with Government of the Republic of Zambia authorities, community tenure, benefit distribution, and engagement with forestry department and Zambian Wildlife Authority (ZAWA)

As part of this initiative is the Community Forests Program (CFP), a USAID-funded, five-year program comprising 700,000 ha of verified forests. There are an additional 2-3 million ha of verified forests within the larger zone that are not the focus of the USAID investment. Annually, 1-2 million MT of CO_2 have been reduced while strengthening conservation enterprises.

Participants and workshop principals visited the Lower Zambezi community zone project sites, including:

1. **Ndubulula Eco-Charcoal Project** – a demonstration of sustainable management of charcoal production using sustainable silvicultural practices to produce charcoal more efficiently with less waste

2. **Namanongo Conservation Farming Demo Plot** – a demonstration plot of maize being grown by a woman farmer using enhanced integrated farming techniques, organic inputs, and low-till agricultural practices

3. **Namonongo Village Chicken Project** – improved poultry production practices on a low-intensity community and household level scale

4. **Meeting with representatives** – participants met with representatives from the Forestry Department and the ZAWA to discuss government collaboration with BCP and the REDD+ program and how the collaboration reinforces the implementation of the program

Due to the heavy rains and washed-out roads, the group was unable to visit the Rufunsa Conservancy to see the REDD+ implementation and verification program first-hand and to discuss conservation activities, biodiversity monitoring, and land management issues in the Lower Zambezi.

DAY 4: THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5

Session 4.1: Report Back from LZRP Field Trip

This session gave participants an opportunity to formulate the observations gathered during the field visit in small groups and to present in plenary.

The participants' outputs and observations are captured in **Annex 3 Session 4.1 Review and Report on Day 3 Field Trip Observations.** Participants were asked to answer the following questions regarding one of the projects assigned to them:

1. How will the implementation of that activity reduce deforestation?

2. How will the implementation of that activity improve sustainable livelihoods?

3. How might you adapt or change this program to enhance intended results?

Session 4.2: Legal Literacy and Advocacy

Mr. Matt Sommerville, Chief of Party for the Zambia-based, Tetra Tech-implemented USAID Tenure and Global Climate Change (TGCC) Project, presented on "Legal Literacy, Land Tenure, and REDD+: Background and Opportunities".

Discussions centered on various legal aspects related to carbon rights (rights to forest resources that generate credits), the relevancy of land tenure to REDD+, current REDD+ tenure activities in Africa, options to prioritize tenure in REDD+, and various other aspects. Issues of tenure and carbon rights must be addressed in REDD+ processes and should avoid, whenever possible, negatively affecting vulnerable populations. Discussions on lessons learned from REDD+ pilot activities in Africa concerning tenure, access, and carbon rights indicated that these activities would also be useful for developing national frameworks on these areas.

Session 4.3: REDD+ Safeguards and Standards: Nuts and Bolts

Mr. Blomley presented on "Developing a Safeguard Information System as part of a country-led approach to REDD+ Safeguards." He defined safeguards as principles, rules, measures, laws, policies, regulations, or procedures designed to ensure positive social and environmental goals and outcomes. Safeguards are designed to ensure social and environmental benefits from projects and adoption of good practices while avoiding potential risks and social and environmental damage resulting from projects.

Describing the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Mr. Blomley added that REDD+ safeguards have been defined in Cancun (2010), Durban (2011), and Warsaw (2013). He said that the UNFCCC has emphasized the elements of 'no harm', good governance, multiple benefits, and greenhouse gas emissions integrity as essential to safeguard development and implementation.

He further described other international REDD+ safeguard regimes, including the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Carbon Fund, the UN-REDD program, the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards Initiative, and the World Bank Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and Economic and Social Management Framework (ESMF).

Mr. Blomley closed by outlining how countries are approaching development of safeguard information systems (SIS), the benefits of SIS, and some of the key steps in the development of a national REDD+ safeguard system. Further details may be found in the **Annex 4 Session 4.3 Developing a Safeguard Information System as part of a country-led approach to REDD+ Safeguards** slide set.

Session 4.4: What do we need to do in terms of SIS in-country? The Tanzania Case Study

Ms. Rahima Njaidi, of Tanzania's MJUMITA — a network of thousands of community members from more than 400 villages across Tanzania — provided the case of Tanzania in a presentation titled, "Developing Tanzania REDD+ Safeguards: Process and Lessons Learned". Ms. Njaidi described the 10-step process that was used in Tanzania to establish and implement REDD+ safeguard standards based on

the REDD+ model developed internationally for national-level standards. They have completed six of the following 10 steps.

1. Raise awareness and build capacity

2. Establish facilitation team

3. Create multi-stakeholder standards committee

4. Develop plan for national REDD+ safeguard standards process

5. Develop draft version of REDD+ safeguard standards (principles, criteria, and indicators)

6. Consult with stakeholders

7. Develop a monitoring plan for assessing and reporting performance of the REDD+ program against the country's safeguards

8. Collect and assess monitoring information

9. Organize stakeholder review of draft Assessment Report

10. Publish the Assessment Report

In closing the presentation, she described lessons learned from the ongoing process in Tanzania and suggestions for what could have been done differently.

The final part of this session was a group exercise. The participants were grouped in Country and Regional Working Groups (if there were not enough delegates to form a country team). In each working group the participants were given the following discussion activity and asked to present their results in plenary:

• Discuss what stage you have reached in terms of developing REDD+ social and environmental safeguards in your respective country / region

• Discuss what opportunities you have in terms of safeguard development (existing laws, regulations, policies, project-level processes)

• Discuss what steps you might take at country level to move forward the safeguard process

The more detailed results may be found in **Annex 3 Day 4: Session 4.4 Current Status of Country REDD+ Social and Environmental Safeguards Development.**

DAY 5: FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6

Sessions 5.1 and 5.2: Country Working Groups – Integration of Gender Aspects into REDD+ Initiatives

During Session 5.2 the participants were grouped by country (if there were enough participants from that country) or by region (West Africa and East Africa). Each group was asked to brainstorm answers to the following questions to describe initiatives completed and proposed to achieve better gender integration in REDD+:

1. What have you done to integrate gender in your programs?

2. What do we need to do to move to better integrate gender?

Following their deliberations, the participants presented the plenary group reports. (Note: Malawi and Zambia formed two groups each due to the large number of participants from each country.)

Working Group – Malawi 1

- Need to have more women REDD+ experts

- Current REDD+ Focal Point is led by a woman

- Undertake institutional context analysis

- Take more positive actions to integrate gender into governance

Working Group - Malawi 2

- Policies, laws, and regulations call for gender-aware practices

- Decision-making processes – inclusion of women in the REDD+ Experts group:

    - Focal point

    - Co-chair for REDD Expert group

- Message development for REDD+ targeting women and children in the REDD+ Action Plan

- Malawi has a full Ministry of Gender, Children and Community Development

- What we need to do:

    - Include gender mainstreaming into REDD+ Action Plan

    - Disseminate communication materials to support advocacy and awareness-raising

Working Group - Zambia 1

- Meet with women's groups and men's groups separately

- Encourage women and men to work together (e.g., a startup in eco-charcoal)

- Take small steps and don't force the issue; be aware of the potential for push-back

Working Group - Zambia 2

- Men, women, and youth have different roles/needs and face different challenges and opportunities

- Pursue stakeholder engagement

- Conduct household surveys/consultation

- Need further development of gender-sensitive tools and monitoring and evaluation systems

Working Group - West Africa and the Democratic Republic of Congo

- Similar to other groups

- Need to address gender-based violence and raise awareness

- Employ a communication strategy to be sure females receive appropriately delivered messages

Working Group - East Africa

Uganda

- Completed actions
    – Have gender mainstreaming strategy in REDD+ safeguards
    – Government is required to have minimum 30-percent female participation (in any committee)

Tanzania

- The REDD+ strategy was not gender-sensitive, so they engaged gender experts to modify it to ensure that gender is included and addressed (including in safeguards)

Kenya

- The REDD+ Policy was modified to ensure at least 33 percent female participation
- Policy also addresses age-related factors
- We need to understand and address cultural barriers

ANNEX 1. WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

TABLE A1.1. WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Name	Gender	Organization	Country	Email
Roselyne Mwila	F	CIFOR	Zambia	
Tom Blomley	M	Acacia Natural Resource Consultants	UK	tom.blomley@acacia-natural-resources.co.uk
Godfrey Phiri	M	BioCarbon Partners	Zambia	godfrey@biocarbonpartners.com
William Chadza	M	CEPA	Malawi	william@cepa.org.mw
Naomi Sakana	F	CIFOR	Zambia	N.Sakane@cgiar.org
Moses Chifwambe Tembo	M	COMACO	Zambia	mctembo@itswild.org
Nyuma Mughogho	F	Department of Forestry	Malawi	nmughogho@hotmail.com
Tangu Tumeo	F	Department of Forestry	Malawi	tangu81@gmail.com
Teddie Kamoto	M	Department of Forestry	Malawi	teddiekamoto@yahoo.co.uk
Harold Chisale	M	Department of Forestry, Malawi	Malawi	chisale.harold2@gmail.com
Lydia Kuganyirway	F	ECOTRUST	Uganda	kuganyirwalydia@yahoo.com
Joseph ADELEGAN	M	ECOWAS	Nigeria	JAdelegan@bidc-ebid.org
Moussa Leko	M	ECOWAS	Nigeria	dallou2009@gmail.com
Charity Mundia	F	Environmental Management Agency	Zambia	cmundia@zema.org.zm
Stephen Kelleher	M	FCMC	USA	stephen.kelleher@fcmcglobal.org
Catherine Kanta	F	FCMC	Zambia	kaysmeen@gmail.com
Roselyn Fosuah ADJEI	F	Ghana REDD+ Secretariat	Ghana	yafossy@yahoo.com
Arineitwe Buherere Valence	M	Government of Uganda	Uganda	alivalence@gmail.com
David Mathenge	M	Green Belt	Kenya	dmathenge@greenbeltmovement.org
Adeleke Adewale	M	IUCN	Ghana	Adewale.Adeleke@iucn.org
Clifford Mkanthama	M	PERFORM	Malawi	mkanthama@yahoo.com
Someni Mteleka	M	TCFG/MJUMITA	Tanzania	smteleka@gmail.com

Susan Kirimania	F	Transparency International	Zambia	skirimania@gmail.com
Nelson Muyaba - ZAWA	M	Zambia Wildlife Authority	Zambia	
Greg Garbinsky	M	Interworks	USA	garbinsky@interworksmadison.com
Chad Dear	M	USAID	USA	chaddear@gmail.com
Diane Russell	F	USAID	USA	dirussell@usaid.gov
Jeremy Boley	M	USAID	Peru	jboley@usaid.gov
Julie Fischer	F	USAID	DRC	jufischer@usaid.gov
Alinafe Chibwana	M	USFS	Malawi	achibwana@live.com
Darren Johnson	M	USFS	Zambia	darrenjohnsonfs@gmail.com
John Kerkering	M	USFS	Malawi	johntkerkering@fs.fed.us
Yoel Kirschner	M	USFS	Malawi	malawi.redd.advisor@gmail.com
Angela Kabuswe	F	USAID	Zambia	akabuswe@usaid.gov
Anna Toness	F	USAID	Zambia	atoness@usaid.gov
Catherine Lwando-Tembo	F	USAID	Zambia	ctembo@usaid.gov
Mwewa Katongo	F	USAID	Zambia	mkatongo@usaid.gov
Rasa Kent	F	USAID	Zambia	rakent@usaid.gov
Xavier Mugumya Nyindo	M	Government of Uganda	Uganda	xavierm_1962@yahoo.com
David Chalmers	M	USAID	Malawi	dchalmers@usaid.gov
Ignatius Makumba	M	Forestry Department	Zambia	inmakumba@gmail.com
Rahima Njaidi	F	MJUMITA	Tanzania	rnjaidi@gmail.com
Matt Sommerville	M	TGCC	Zambia	matt.sommerville@tetratech.com

ANNEX 2. WORKSHOP AGENDA

Africa Regional Training Workshop

Social and Environmental Considerations in REDD+ and Related Natural Resource Management Programs

Chisamba, Zambia, February 1 – 6, 2015

The overall workshop goal is to enhance the social and environmental integrity of the work of USAID and partners in Eastern and Southern Africa on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancements of forest carbon stocks (REDD+) and related programs.

Specific objectives of the workshop are:

- to learn about and share global, regional, and national policies, principles, practices, and lessons related to the integration of social and environmental considerations in REDD+ and relevant natural resource management (NRM) sectors; and

- to identify the gaps, follow-on opportunities, and priority next steps in the application of the principles, practices, and lessons to enhance the social and environmental aspects of NRM programs, including REDD+ in the participant countries.

Agenda

Arrival Day – February 1				
Timing	**No.**	**Topic**	**Key Points/Objectives**	**Presenter**
5:00 pm	0.1	**Registration, Icebreaker, and Workshop Expectations**	Informal session for participants to meet each other, lay the groundwork for the workshop, and identify participants' expectations of the workshop and familiarity with the subject matter	Greg Garbinsky, Diane Russell et al.
7:00 pm		**Dinner**		

Day 1 – February 2				
Timing	**No.**	**Topic**	**Key Points/Objectives** By the end of each session, participants will be able to:	**Presenter**
8:30 am	1.1	*Welcome: Dr. Diane Russell,* USAID Forestry and Biodiversity Office		Welcome: Dr. Russell
9:00 am	1.2	**The BIG PICTURE: Building a Conceptual Model for Addressing Social and Environmental Considerations for REDD+**	• Describe key concepts and terms in systems thinking • Develop a systems model for REDD+	Diane Russell and Chad Dear
10:30 am		**Coffee Break**		
11:00 – 12:30 pm	1.3	**Key Social and Environmental Components and Definitions**	• Identify key social and environmental components of REDD+ processes • Define those components according to accepted definitions and current practice • Describe specific countries' experiences in applying some of these components and concepts	Diane Russell and participant countries
12:30 pm		**Lunch**		
1:30 - 3:00 pm	1.4	*World Café* **(carousel for four topics)** **Social and Environmental Challenges and Opportunities** o **Table 1:** Environmental Challenges (Diane) o **Table 2:** Environmental Opportunities (Stephen) o **Table 3:** Social Challenges (Tom) o **Table 4:** Social Opportunities (Chad)	• Identify key social and environmental challenges and opportunities in the region • Explore specific case examples of how these items are addressed in their countries **Key Question:** *What are the most significant challenges and opportunities in implementing REDD+?* **Round 1:** 20 minutes **Round 2:** 15 minutes	Greg plus table moderators

Timing	No.	Topic	Key Points/Objectives	Presenter
			Round 3: 10 minutes	
			Group reports in plenary: 5 min. each	
			(20 min)	
			Gallery Walk and Dot Voting for top-two in each category	
			**Open Coffee Break**	
3:00 – 3:45 pm	1.5	**USAID Climate Change/REDD+ Policy Overview**	• Understand the key policy commitments of the U.S. Government in REDD+ • Understand REDD+ dynamics in light of the December 2014 Conference of Parties (COP) • Understand the role of social and environmental factors in U.S. Government policy • Describe how the U.S. Government and other donors interact on REDD+ policy (United States, Norway, FCPF, UN-REDD, others?)	Evan Notman (via GoToMeeting remote)
3:45 – 4:30 pm	1.6	**Small Group Work on linking Social Challenges to Social Opportunities and Environmental Challenges to Environmental Opportunities**	• Link the challenges and opportunities to the social and environmental components and the conceptual model (30 min) **Debrief Key Question**: What was a major change/addition to your original model? Why?	
4:30 – 5:15 pm	1.7	**Plenary – Building a Collective REDD+ Model**	• Begin developing a collective model based on your knowledge and experience	Greg et al.
5:30 pm		**Review/Thank you and announcements/prep for the next day**		

Day 2 – February 3				
Timing	**No.**	**Topic**	**Key Points/Objectives** By the end of each session, participants will be able to:	**Presenter**

Time		Session	Objectives	Presenter
8:30 am		**Welcome back, announcements, reflections on key messages from previous day**		Greg
9:00 am	**2.1**	**Biological Diversity and REDD+ : How can REDD+ deliver on biodiversity conservation objectives?**	• Understand how biodiversity issues are being addressed in different REDD+ activities, particularly National REDD+ programs and specific forest carbon projects • See an example from Malawi of stakeholder mapping of potential partners to address biodiversity in REDD+ • Work in small groups to generate recommendations on how REDD+ activities could be designed to enhance biodiversity impacts of REDD+ strategies and activities	Stephen Kelleher and Yoel Kirschner
10:30 am		**Coffee Break**		
11:00 am	**2.2**	**Social Diversity and Engagement**	• Describe different types and objectives of stakeholder engagement • Discuss key considerations for determining how and why to engage stakeholders • Identify the system-wide connections among stakeholders • Understand gender implications in stakeholder engagement • Link social engagement aspects to the conceptual model and show how it can affect outcomes positively or negatively	Chad Dear and Greg Garbinsky
12:30 pm		**Lunch**		

Timing	No.	Topic	Key Points/Objectives	Presenter
1:30 pm	2.3	**Models of Benefit-Sharing: Lessons from others**	• Understand the benefits and risks of REDD+ • Understand who bears the risks and who reaps the benefits • Explore examples of benefit-sharing in REDD+ and project-level relevance • Identify what other incentives there are, including non-carbon benefits, co-benefits, etc. • Understand key models for benefit-sharing and experiences (good and bad) • Link benefit-sharing systems back to the conceptual model	Tom Bromley
3:00 pm		**Coffee Break**		
3:30 pm	2.4	**Building from Experience – Community Forestry**	• Identify significant lessons learned from experiences in community forestry for informing REDD+ programs • Apply those lessons to their National REDD+ programs • Understand community forestry and other forest management models in their historical context • Generate specific questions and issues to investigate during the field trip on Day 3	Tom
5:00 pm		**Thank you and announcements for the next day**		Greg

Day 3 – February 4				
Timing	**No.**	**Topic**	**Key Points/Objectives**	**Presenter**
All Day	3.1	**Field Trip to BioCarbon Partners Site**	• Visit examples of community-based projects to explore these types of activities in the context of REDD+	BioCarbon Partners staff

| | | | • Visit a national park adjacent to the BioCarbon REDD+ project to learn about the development and implementation of this REDD+ example

• Identify specific Protecting Ecosystems and Restoring Forests in Malawi (PERFORM) Social and Environmental Standards (SES) REDD+ elements such as benefit sharing, biodiversity monitoring, stakeholder participation/engagement, direct and indirect drivers of forest lost and degradation, REDD+ project design, and environmental and social risks/opportunities | |

Day 4 – February 5				
Timing	**No.**	**Topic**	**Key Points/Objectives** By the end of this session, participants will be able to:	**Presenter**
8:30 am		**Welcome back, announcements, and reflections on key messages and takeaways from field trip**		*Greg/All*
9:00 am	**4.1**	**Report back from field trip teams**	• Groups report back on the thoughts, observations, and information gathered during the previous day's field trip	
10:30 am		Coffee Break		
11:00 – 11:45 am	**4.2**	**Legal Literacy and Advocacy**	• Understand the legal frameworks and concepts that inform REDD+ programs	Matt Somerville

			• Explore issues related to land tenure and property rights, tenure and climate change, and potential conflicts related to tenure	
11:45 – 1:00 pm	4.3	**REDD+ Safeguards and Standards – NUTS AND BOLTS: Compliance Requirements for Safeguards, Standards and Safeguard Information Systems (SIS)** **Why we have safeguards and SIS**	• What REDD+ safeguards are and why they are needed • Understand national versus international demands and agendas • Understand safeguards in UNFCCC / SIS, "addressing and respecting" safeguards, legal vs. voluntary approaches • Understand donor requirements and guidelines: WB/SESA, UN-REDD, REDD+ SES • Know how to develop an SIS, what guidance is available, and what progress has been made	Tom Blomley
1:00 pm		**Lunch**		
2:00 – 3:30 pm	4.4	**What do we need to do in terms of SIS in country? Compliance and (Integrating Best Practices into Compliance): Tanzania Case Study**	• Identify lessons learned from developing national safeguards in Tanzania • Think about planning for safeguard development at national level within respective countries – taking stock of progress to date and challenges remaining • Link back to conceptual model	Tom Blomley and Rahima Njaidi (Tanzania)
3:30 pm		**Coffee Break**		
4:00 – 5:00 pm	4.5	**Country Work Groups – Safeguards Information Systems**	• Identify what their country is doing in SIS and which key stage they have reached	Working Groups (Tom, Rahima, and facilitators support)

Africa Regional Training Workshop Summary Report: Social and Environmental Considerations in REDD+ and Related Natural Resources Management Programs

24

			• Identify which elements should be included in the National REDD+ SIS	
			• Identify gaps and priority actions for social and environmental considerations in REDD+ and non-REDD+ situations	
			• Identify next steps	
5:00 pm		**Review and summarize (country groups may continue working); thank you and announcements for the next day**		Greg

Day 5 – February 6				
Timing	**No.**	**Topic**	**Key Points/Objectives**	**Presenter**
8:30 am		**Welcome back, announcements, and reflections on key messages from previous day**		Greg et al.
9:00 am	**5.1**	**Report back on SIS information from Day 4**	Report back summaries from session 4.5 and way forward	Tom, Rahima, and facilitators
10:30 am	**5.2**	**Simultaneous sessions on top priority issues**		
Coffee Break - Open				
10:30 am	**5.2**	*Open space sessions on priority needs*	During the course of the week we will capture Open Space topics (or parking lot topics) that the group may want more time to discuss or share information/knowledge/experience on. The number of Open Space sessions/topics will be determined by the amount of interest generated for each topic. We could have simultaneous topics that run 30 minutes long, and then the groups could rotate to a different topic (2 times) for example.	Greg and resource persons
12:00 pm		**Wrap-up, workshop evaluations, and closing**		

12:30 pm	**Lunch**
2:00 pm	**End of workshop; departure**

ANNEX 3. OUTPUTS FROM WORKING GROUP SESSIONS

Outputs from Working Group Sessions – Africa Regional Training Workshop on Social and Environmental Considerations in REDD+ and Related Natural Resources Management Programs

The following working group outputs were captured in the noted sessions on flip charts during the training workshop. To the extent possible, descriptions and outputs were captured verbatim with some formatting changes for consistency.

DAY 1: SESSION 1.3. KEY SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL TERMS AND CONCEPTS FOR REDD+

Following the session 1.3 presentation by Dr. Russell, the bullet points below were gathered during a facilitated discussion with the plenary group. The points focus around the following questions:

- What social and environmental terms, concepts, and issues are missing?

- Has your country, institution, or project developed specific definitions of the terms, and if so, what are they?

Missing Terms, Concepts, and Issues

- Social safeguards, e.g., resettlement

- Benefit sharing – not integrated

- Intra-governmental coordination (part of stakeholder engagement)

- Standards – setting reference levels and data

- Demystification of REDD+ awareness, cross-country learning

- Payments for ecosystem services (PES)

- Gender mainstreaming

- REDD+ and other standards and resettlement action plan

- Define project area and scale boundaries

- Free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC)

- Leakage management

Africa Regional Training Workshop Summary Report: Social and Environmental Considerations in REDD+ and Related Natural Resources Management Programs

27

- Grievance and redress

- Land tenure analysis

- Adaptation

Resources Needed

- Zambia draft developed strategy TBD

- Tanzania – indigenous people definition

- Action plan for mainstreaming gender

- Framework for REDD+ including FPIC

- Uganda Guidelines – REDD+ nationally and sub-nationally

- BCP works with Zambia wildlife FPIC tool and forestry department

- Ghana – REDD+ working group

- Zambia – developing harmonized baseline and tools

- Timelines – pilot before national need to get to uniform definitions

DAY 1: SESSION 1.4. WORLD CAFÉ OUTPUTS ON SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The following outputs were gathered during the **Session 1.4 World Café: Social and Environmental Challenges and Opportunities.** Participants circulated to three of four tables focusing on the following key question during the allotted timeframe for that round:

- Key Question: What are the most significant challenges and opportunities in implementing REDD+ programs in your country and your experience?

  – Round 1: 20 minutes

  – Round 2: 15 minutes

  – Round 3: 10 minutes

- The four tables were organized and moderated by:

  – Group 1: Environmental Challenges (D. Russell)

  – Group 2: Environmental Opportunities (S. Kelleher)

  – Group 3: Social Challenges (T. Blomley)

  – Group 4: Social Opportunities (C. Dear)

Participants were free to choose their top three topics (groups) to which to rotate in the three rounds. After gathering their contributions via Post-it Notes, all participants had an opportunity to circulate in a gallery walk to view group discussion contributions before receiving eight total dots. Participants could

allocate two dots per group topic, marking the most significant ideas/concepts/issues, in their view, in each of the four group topics.

The results were then organized by each group moderator and presented in the plenary with the summary results below. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of dot votes that particular item received. Items have been listed in order, with the top three vote-getters leading each list and highlighted in bold.

Group 1: Environmental Challenges

- Deforestation (+14)

- Mandate overlap agencies & ministries = conflict, poor mgt (+13)

- Encroachment (+12)

- Emissions and other environmental challenges from "sustainable intensification" (+7)

- Mining (unsustainable)/Lack of land reclamation (+5)

- Climate change (+1)

- Overharvesting of species degradation (+1)

- Livestock and grazing

- Land scarcity/land pressure (+1)

- Proper Fire Management Regimes are absent in Miombo; hence, there are increased threats of loss of carbon from trees and increased carbon through combustion of trees (+2)

- Lack of harmonization of forest policies at regional levels (+2)

- Transboundary leakage

- Complexity in valuation of natural resources due to the non-monitory trans-nature of some of the services (+3)

- Changes/incompatible environmental policies, e.g., preference for plantation forestry over natural/ indigenous forest (+2)

- Poor/lack of land use plans (+1)

Group 2: Environmental Opportunities

- Environmental outcomes for REDD (+22), which includes the following subcategories:

  - Through ⬆ forest protection REDD+ : increased water quantity and quality from watershed areas

  - Increase forest cover

  - Carbon sequestration improved ecosystem services

- Improve carbon sequestration, stabilize/soil fertility, recycling of water, improve productivity, stabilize soil structure

- Stabilize soil fertility

- Stabilize soil structure / enhance soil fertility

- Implementation enhanced carbon stocks, i.e., good air quality

- Reduced siltation and thus reduced flooding

- Opportunities for landscape-scale management (+20), which includes the following subcategories:

  - Sustainable agricultural production

  - Creations of forest management plans

  - REDD+ is a landscape-scale pursuit, and harmonization of all NRM policies is needed for REDD+ to work ==> it's not so much an environmental opportunity as it is a requirement

  - Wildlife conservation

  - Integrated project

    - Multi-disciplinary

    - Multi-scales

  - Transfrontier environment protect implementation

  - Climate that supports tree planting

- Opportunities: Additional Land (+12), which includes the following subcategories:

  - Environmental opportunities

    - Presence of sound environmental laws and policies

    - Improved community participation in environmental conservation

  - Recognition of the link between environment and development at the international level

  - Data from multiple sources (+9)

  - Biodiversity inventories in gazetted forest reserves = absent formal MRV and protection

  - Incorporating a broad suite of environmental data needs into REDD+ pursuits (e.g., National Forest Inventory)

  - REDD+ provides financial resources to improve NRM capacity biodiversity (increase at multiple scales. Financial opportunities) (+3)

Group 3: Social Challenges (and Risks and Threats; added to the title by the moderator)

- Economic value of REDD+ may not be competitive (including benefits) with other land use choice (+18)

- Loss of livelihoods for forest-dependent communities – charcoal, NTFP, timber, etc. (+8)

- Elite capture including land and resource "grabbing" (+8)

- Horizontal benefit-sharing arrangement (+7)

- Lack of information in locally appropriate formats (+6)

- Conflicting policies for agriculture expansion and forest land restoration (+5)

- Gender inequalities (+2)

- Lack of attention to addressing real drivers of deforestation (+1)

- Apathy: too long a timeline, low payoff, confused expectations (+2)

- Human wildlife conflict and forest area management

- Displacement of traditional communities (+1)

- REDD+ initiative being seen as "Environmental colonialism". Do those who pollute still pollute and let others do tree planting (increase carbon sink)? (+2)

- Loss of land and natural resource tenure (+1)

- Lack of cultural knowledge re: technologies not adapting

- Risk of losing traditional or land social values (+3)

- Lack of access to sustainable and clean affordable energy

- Disrupt traditional land rules relating to allocation of land and inheritance

- Food insecurity (+2)

- Poor consultation/encouragement means some groups ignored

Group 4: Social Opportunities

- Local governance (+26), which includes the following subcategories:
    - Enhancement of local governance for NRM
    - Improved multi-scale governance and transparency
    - Improved local government capacity
- Local empowerment (CBNRM) (+13), which includes the following subcategories:
    - Decentralization (looking at village-, district-, and national-level administration linkages)
    - Community empowerment
        - Education/scholarship for children
        - Microfinance

- – Free prior informed consent
- Clarity of tenure (+11), which includes the following subcategories:
    - – Improved land/forest tenure
    - – Define resource rights
    - – Clarify individual community boundaries and responsibilities
- Local law enforcement strengthen (+6)
    - – Local, national sharing of NRM enforcement
    - – Engagement/coordination of government, NGO, local-level actions on holistic NRM and service delivery in areas that are not usually served
- Job creation (+2)
    - – It leads to improved livelihoods
    - – Adding short-term benefits under the umbrella of REDD+ Initiative
    - – Skill development
    - – ↑ Small businesses (e.g., NTFP)
- Link markets to conservation results (+1)
    - – No poaching
    - – For example, premium prices for compliance with conservation agroforestry, woodlands
- Integrating (fisheries, forests, wildlife, agriculture, land, and water) and formalizing nesting within existing structures, participatory management plans and institutional CBNRM structures (+4)
- Appreciation of natural ecosystem services (+1)

DAY 2: SESSION 2.1. BIODIVERSITY

The participants were organized into country groups (Malawi formed two groups due to their large size; there was also a West Africa regional group and an East Africa regional group) and were given the following questions to discuss and provide findings on the following topics:

- Has your country integrated biodiversity considerations into National REDD+ Strategies, policies, or projects? If so, how? If not, why?
- Are there biodiversity conservation policies in place that can be used to inform REDD+ strategies in your country, institution, or program? What are these policies, and how have you applied them to REDD+?
- What are the opportunities and challenges for integrating biodiversity into REDD+, taking into account the approach in Malawi?

Group Work on Biodiversity – West Africa Group

(1)

- World Bank social and environmental safeguards policies guide Ghana's REDD+ readiness process; therefore, the SESA, REDD+, strategy (drafts), and R-PD are all strong on biodiversity

- Revised forest and wildlife policy 2012 incorporates biodiversity

- FIP also mentions biodiversity

- Ghana National climate change policy also mentions biodiversity

(2)

- ECOWAS Forest and Wildlife Policy (2005)

- ECOWAS Convergence Plan (2013)

- Ghana Forest and Wildlife Policy (2012)

- Municipal Climate Change Programme (MCCP) (2013)

- Policy Brief on Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) 2010 mentions biodiversity

- National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)

(3)

Challenges

- More demand for land for agricultural purposes

- Inadequate resources for implementation (competition for land for logging and mining activities)

Opportunities

- Globally significant biodiversity areas (GSBAs) present in Ghana

- Ghana Forestry commission already has implemented some biodiversity projects (TIRMP I & II); therefore, that is an entry point

- National Forest Plantation Development Program

Group Work on Biodiversity – East Africa Group

(1)

- Kenya: Not clearly defined – only as co-benefit

- Tanzania: Not explicit – only refers to links with NBSAP

- Uganda: No strategy for REDD+ yet, but sub-program on multiple benefits under REDD+

(2)

- Kenya: Biodiversity Information System, Birdlife International – standardized biodiversity monitoring system. Tanzania included.

- Tanzania: Environmental management act, forest act, wildlife conservation act, national safeguards include biodiversity aspects (e.g., forest conversions)

(3)

- Uganda: most high biodiversity sites are included in protected areas (national parks and forest reserves), no national system for biodiversity monitoring, agencies undertake own monitoring in their own areas.

Group Work on Biodiversity – Malawi – Group 1 (Malawi was broken up into two groups due to size)

(1) Wildlife and biodiversity monitoring framework into NFI/NRI proposal

(2) MW National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, Draft Revised Environmental Management Bill (Revised Environmental Management Act) addresses (1) benefit-sharing and access, (2) care and management of biodiversity, and (3) PES

(3) Opportunities

- already have a strategy

- in process of developing REDD+ strategy

- mobilize resources

(4) Challenges

- harmonization

- resources/costs

- coordination

Group Work on Biodiversity – Malawi – Group 2

- National REDD+ Strategy – Not in place

- draft national action plan considers biodiversity (NRI)

- Policy – Yes

- the national forestry policy calls for the conservation of biodiversity

- Projects – Yes

- Kulera

- Plan Vivo

- PERFORM – designed to align with USAID biodiversity Code

- Shire basin – technical assistance on biodiversity recruited
- Projects – No
    - NBSAP – prioritizes issues of biodiversity
    - NB Program – to harmonize biodiversity conservation initiatives
    - NFB framework
    - Not yet applied to REDD+ but will be considered
- Opportunities
    - MCFW (where Forestry & Wildlife Depts. train young Malawians)
- Challenges
    - No Standardized monitoring systems

Group Work on Biodiversity – Zambia

(1) National REDD+ Strategy coming out February 2015 (informal conversations indicate that it has been taken into consideration)

- The National Forest Policy & the Forest Act are coming out now and complement each other
- Three REDD+ projects: COMACO CFP and Lower Zambezi REDD+ Project – integrate biodiversity objectives

(2) The De-centralization Policy

- The Forest Policy & Act
- ZAWA Act
- The National Policy on Environment
- The Environmental Management Agency (EMA)
- The National Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan
- How? They complement each other

(3) Opportunities

- ILCIA II Data set
- Forest Cover maps that will set the baseline for all projects
- Allows the government to coordinate all REDD+ activities, since all the projects start around the same time
- Provincial monitoring
- International frameworks

(4) Challenges

- – Tenure

- – Grievance, mechanism

- – Baseline

- – Methodology

DAY 4: SESSION 4.1. REVIEW AND REPORT ON DAY 3 FIELD TRIP OBSERVATIONS

During this session, participants were asked to report on their observations from the Day 3 Field Trip to the BioCarbon Partners field sites in the Lower Zambezi area. During the field trip, participants visited and observed three major activities of the program:

1. Conservation agriculture project: a woman farmer employing conservation agriculture and integrated farming techniques in a pilot maize field

2. Eco-Charcoal project: a community-based enterprise of producing charcoal using low-impact harvesting/production techniques in a sustainable way

3. Village chicken project: a farmer implementing an enhanced poultry production small-scale operation with support from BioCarbon Partners

The participants' outputs and observations are captured below (from their flip charts). Participants were asked to answer the following questions regarding one of the projects assigned to them:

- How will implementing that activity reduce deforestation?

- How will implementing that activity improve sustainable livelihoods?

- How might you adapt or change this program to enhance the intended results?

Working Group 1 – Review of the Conservation Agriculture Project

Positives

- Higher yields ==> more efficient use of land

- ↑ Soil carbon

- Increased soil fertility ==> higher income

- Alternative income to destructive livelihoods

Questions

- Population growth still driving deforestation

- Clear link between conservation agriculture and deforestation?

How to enhance this program?

- Agroforestry? (slowly – first year of conservation agriculture)

- Integrated land-use planning (engagement of local/traditional authority – chiefs, etc.)

- Institute Family Planning nationally

Working Group 2 – Review of the Conservation Agriculture Project

<u>Benefits</u>

- Soil enhancement improvement in crop yield/health

- Reduction in shifting cultivation

- Reduction in deforestation (new areas will not be cleared for agriculture)

- Organic fertilizer = saved money

- Reduction in charcoal production

<u>Livelihoods</u>

- Increased food security

- Improved nutrition (chickens local consumption)

- Additional form of income (chickens)

<u>What improvements would you make?</u>

- Establish a crop yield baseline

- Identify markets for excess yields

- AgroForestry

- Crop diversification (legumes, etc.)

<u>Conclusions</u>

- Scalable

- Risk of adoption by those who just want to make money = forest loss

(Note: This group also had time to review the Eco-Charcoal Project. Their comments/observations are below.)

Eco-Charcoal Project

<u>Benefits</u>

- Improved efficiency (20-30 percent) = less trees needed/kg

- Sustainable forest management (diameter limit harvesting)

- Assisted natural regeneration (Coppice)

- Re-planting of native species to re-forest kiln scars

Questions

- How much land area is needed in order for this model to be sustainable in terms of conservation and livelihoods?

Working Group 3 – Review of the Village Chicken Project

Reduced Deforestation

- Yes, in the long term based on the success of the business and number of chickens

- No, because the farmer visited was not involved in charcoal production (no evidence)

Livelihood

- Increase income from chicken sales/agricultural production

- Improved food security

- Increased access to manure from the droppings for conservation agriculture

- Alarm to wake him every morning

Adapting the chicken project

- Better targeting of beneficiaries to those that are directly involved in activities contributing to deforestation, e.g., charcoal production

- Increase the profitability of the chicken project to effectively compete with charcoal business by:

    - increasing the number of chickens; and

    - providing a ready market

- Encourage people to shift to eco-charcoal project

- Provide an opportunity for bank loan access to the groups of farmers doing chicken business

Working Group 4 – Review of the Village Chicken Project

- Developed at Mr. Mbewe's farm by BCP as a learning center

- Have a fully equipped chick rearing house with feeding troughs

- Farmer had initially 10 chicken, 10 were availed by BCP (started with 20)

- Numbers grew, but neighbor's dog killed 50 chickens

- He currently has 50+ chickens (hens, ducks, guinea fowl)

(1) The activity vs. deforestation reduction

1. Chicken rearing as an alternative to charcoal burning, thus reducing deforestation (contract with BCP)

2. Use of manure on farm improves soil productivity, thus avoiding shifting cultivation, which leads to deforestation

<u>(2) Activity vs. Sustainable Livelihoods Improvement</u>

- Extra income from sale of chicken and chicken products leads to more family disposable income and food security (increased farm production from manure)

- Increasing chicken population leads to sustained flow of income to the family

- Sustainable agricultural practices, ensuring natural soil fertility and conservation (no income used or inorganic fertilizers)

<u>(3) Adapting or changing the program to enhance results</u>

- Creation of farmer cooperatives to improve marketing for higher returns and market bargaining power

- Entrepreneurship activities development in the villages to support enterprises, e.g., chicken feed outlets

Working Group 5 – Review of the Eco-charcoal Project

<u>Deforestation Reduction</u>

- Improved regeneration because of proper harvesting (stumps)

- Improved efficiency in charcoal production (improved kiln)

- Control of external factors of deforestation (monitoring, migration)

- Improved charcoal use efficiency (quality/high density charcoal)

- Selective harvesting

- Enrichment planting

- Engagement of community in sustainable forest management

<u>Sustainable Livelihoods</u>

- Assured source of income (short and long term)

- Building of social capital

- Branding

<u>Adaption/Changes</u>

- Increased cash flow in the business

- Fallback plan (establishing of woodlot)

- Promote energy efficient stores

- Promote agro-forestry practices

- Information dissemination

- Policy engagement

- Community ownership

Working Group 6 – Review of the Eco-charcoal Project

<u>Positives (+)</u>

- Less wood for equal work energy

- Relies on different tree species

- Coppicing

- Improved charcoal quality

- Reduce the number of days: seven instead of 14

- Association – community-based

<u>Negatives (-)</u>

- Questionable link between individual effort and benefits

- No premium yet

- No market infrastructure – reliance on project

- Obeying the law is costly – tax, permits

- No supportive forest policy and trade policy

- Do labor savings and profit lead to less deforestation?

<u>Enhancing Eco-Charcoal</u>

<u>National level</u>

- Policy advocacy – forest, trade

- Replication of concept in other areas

- Enforcement of existing regulations

- Private sector on purchase and sale for demand

<u>Community level</u>

- Targeting resources to demonstrated commitment – individual, associations

- Training on technology

- Link to market

- Community-based land use planning

Conservation Farming

- Less area cleared for farming

- Increased yield = increased revenue

- Incentive to diversify

- No need for inorganic fertilizer

Adapting/Changing

- Ensure that increased yield does not lead to extensive agriculture – opening of new farms

- Use extension workers to scale up

DAY 4: SESSION 4.4. CURRENT STATUS OF COUNTRY REDD+ SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SAFEGUARDS DEVELOPMENT

During this session participants were grouped in country working groups and, if there were not enough delegates to form a country team, in regional working groups. In each working group, the participants were asked to do the following and then to present their results in plenary:

- Discuss what stage you have reached in terms of developing REDD+ social and environmental safeguards in your respective country/region

- Discuss what opportunities you have in terms of safeguarding development (existing laws, regulations, policies, project-level processes)

- Discuss what steps you might take at country level to move forward the safeguard process

Working Group – Ghana

- First phase of readiness process completed

- Draft final report of:

    – SESA

    – Benefit-sharing

    – FGRM

    – ESMF

    – RPF

    – Gender RM

- ECOWAS Convergence Plan for priority intervention area
  - Participation and involvement of local communities
  - Nigeria and Liberia currently at readiness phase
- National REDD working Group
- SESA and other working group
- National Forest Forum/Multi stakeholder at community levels
- Road show on REDD+
- Additional resources from FCPF
- Existing pilots
- Existing laws/policies
- corruption

East Africa Regional (this group also comprised others from the East Africa region)

- ECOWAS Forest Policy
- ECOWAS Convergence Plan
- Testing BS and FGRM at pilot levels

Working Group – Uganda

Status

- Institutional framework in place
  - Awareness-raising
  - National climate change policy committee
  - National technical committee
  - REDD+ task forces: (i) policy; (ii) SESA; (iii) MRV
- Procurement of the consultants (SESA, FGRM, Benefit-Sharing Mechanism), awareness-raising

Opportunities

- UN-REDD support, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), etc.
- Forest laws, environmental laws, land laws, organizations
- A number of projects that have piloted some safeguards
- World Bank Operational Policies

Working Group – Zambia

- Implementation strategy underwent consultations

- Implementation strategy under review (consultant engaged – led to a biodiversity review of Forest Policy & Act)

Opportunities

1. Environment Management Act (EMA) 2011/SEA EIA

2. Forest Law & Policy

3. ZAWA Act

4. National Policy on Env.

5. Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan

6. COMACO BCP corruption risk assessment

Steps

1. Implementation strategy in place

2. GAP Analysis

3. Opportunity to identify and possibly apply (UNFCCC, World Bank) approach

Working Group – Malawi 1 (there were two Malawi groups due to the large number of participants)

1. No current development of safeguards

2. (a) Existing Laws and Policies

    - EMA

    - FA (1997)

    - CBFM (2001) Supplement to the FP.

    - STDs and Guidelines for PFM

   (b) Project-Level Policies

    - SRBMP – WB Safeguards

    - Kulera – Plan Vivo

    - SLM – EMA

   (c) Existing REDD+ Management Structures, e.g.:

    - REx

    - REDD+ WGs

- SC/TC on climate change

(d) Existence of MRRP and PERFORM Projects

- Resources

(e) Revision of the Forest Policy and Act, development of the Climate Change Policy

(f) Development of SES as an objective and as the Action Plan

3. Steps to move Safeguard Process forward

- Awareness-raising/capacity building

- Resource mobilization

- Process Department for SES

Working Group – Malawi 2

1. Stage – Various policy analyses

    - UN-REDD targeted support and Capacity Needs Assessment

    - Tenure analyses

    - REDD+ readiness assessment

    - Strategy guidance

    - Corruption Risk Assessment

What opportunities?

    - Ongoing policy reviews

        - Forestry, Environment, Climate Change, Land

    - Projects

        - PERFORM – Kulera (lessons learned)

        - MRRP

    - Partnerships

        - UN-REDD

Steps to be taken

- Communications and awareness strategy needed

- Reflection/assessment/next steps on completed work

- Finalize the action plan and long-term strategy, then move on to implementation

DAY 5: SESSION 5.2. COUNTRY WORKING GROUPS: INTEGRATION OF GENDER INTO REDD+ INITIATIVES

During Session 5.2 the participants were grouped by country (if there were enough participants from that country) or by region (West Africa and East Africa). Each group was asked to brainstorm answers to the following questions to describe completed and proposed initiatives to achieve better gender integration in REDD+:

1. What have you done to integrate gender in your programs?

2. What do we need to do to move to better integrate gender?

Gender Integration Working Group – West Africa and the Democratic Republic of Congo

* Similar to other groups

* Need to address gender-based violence (GBV) and raise awareness

* Have messaging/communications strategy to be sure females get the message

Gender Integration Working Group – East Africa

Uganda

* Done so far

* Have gender mainstreaming strategy in REDD+ safeguards

* Government has to have 30-percent female participation (any committee)

Tanzania

* Strategy was not gender-sensitive, so engaged gender experts to modify REDD+ strategy to ensure gender is included and addressed

* Also in safeguards

Kenya

* Policy modified to endure at least 33 percent female participation

* Addresses age as well

* What we need to do?

    – Understand and address cultural barriers

Gender Integration Working Group – Malawi 1

* REDD+ experts headed by women

* REDD+ FP is led by a woman

- Institutional context analysis

- Integrating gender into governance

Gender Integration Working Group – Malawi 2

1. Policies, laws, regulations PLR call for gender aware practices

2. Decision-making processes – inclusion of women in REDD ExG

   – Ps

   – Focal point

   – Co-chair for REDD Exp G

3. Message development for REDD+ @ targeting women and children in REDD+ Action Plan

4. Full ministry on gender and child development

5. What we need to do:

   – Gender mainstreaming into REDD+ Action Plan

   – Dissemination (advocacy and awareness) – communication materials to support advocacy & awareness raising

Gender Integration Working Group – Zambia 1

- Meet with women's groups and men's groups separately

- Women and men working together (e.g., a start in eco-charcoal)

- Take small steps, don't force the issue; push back potential

Gender Integration Working Group – Zambia 2

- Men, women, and youth have different roles/needs and face different challenges and opportunities

- Stakeholder engagement

- Household surveys/consultation

- Development of gender-sensitive tools

- Development of gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation systems

ANNEX 4. PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

In the feedback on the workshop evaluation forms, 97 percent of participants **agreed** or **strongly agreed** that the workshop objectives had been met. All participants (100 percent of respondents) **agreed or strongly agreed** that the workshop was relevant to their work, useful to them personally, and provided opportunities for networking. More than 93 percent of participants also responded that they felt their institution would increase its capacity to address change issues as a result of this workshop.

TABLE A4.1. SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORMS

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Don't Know/ No Answer	
	Nbr	%	Nbr	%	Nbr	%	Nbr	%	Nbr	%	Nbr	%
The objectives of the activity were clear	13	45%	15	52%	0		0		0		1	3%
The objectives of the activity were achieved	5	17%	17	59%	0		0		0		1	3%
The activity was useful to me personally	19	66%	9	31%	0		0		0		1	3%
The activity was relevant to my work	20	69%	9	31%	0		0		0		0	0%
The activity provided practical information, knowledge, and/or skills	10	34%	18	62%	0		0		0		1	3%
The activity provided opportunities for networking	19	66%	9	31%	1	3%	0		0		0	0
The activity provided opportunities for active participation	15	52%	14	48%	0		0		0		0	0

	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Neutral		Not Satisfied		Very Unsatisfied		Don't Know/ No Answer	
The quality of the presenters	18	62%	11	38%								
The quality of materials and audio/visual presentations	17	59%	9	31%	1	3%					2	7%
The quality of the facilities, logistics, and meals/refreshments	17	59%	12	41%								
The pace of the activity (how fast material was covered)	10	34%	15	52%	3	10%					1	3%
	YES		NO		No Answer							
Will your institution increase its capacity to address change issues as a result of this workshop?	27	93%	1	3%	1	3%						